



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/491,121

01/24/2000

Branko Kovacevic

1458-0000010

8119

34456 7590 08/02/2011
LARSON NEWMAN, LLP
5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE
SUITE 200
AUSTIN, TX 78730

EXAMINER

AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2483

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/02/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte BRANKO KOVACEVIC and KEVORK KECHICHIAN

Appeal 2011-005287
Application 09/491,121
Technology Center 2400

Before ALLEN R. MacDONALD, GREGORY J. GONSALVES, and
JASON V. MORGAN, Administrative Patent Judges.

GONSALVES, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF CASE
Introduction

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from a final rejection of claims 16-19 and 22-24. (App. Br. 2.) We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

Examiner's Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 16-19 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hoogenboom (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,250, May 14, 1996) and Ort (U.S. Patent No. 6,043,828, March 28, 2000). (Ans. 3.)

The Examiner rejected claims 22-24 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Hoogenboom. (Ans. 3.)

Exemplary Claim

Exemplary independent claim 16 under appeal reads as follows:

16. A method of parsing a data packet, the method comprising:
- providing a start indicator to a first parser, the start indicator indicating a first data block of the data packet, the data packet having a predetermined number of data blocks;
 - analyzing at the first parser at least a portion of the first N data blocks after the start of the data packet to determine a data type of a subsequent data block of the data packet, wherein the subsequent data block is after the first N data blocks;
 - enabling a second parser to receive the subsequent data block when the data type of the subsequent data block is a first data type; and
 - enabling a third parser to receive the subsequent data block when the data type of the subsequent data block is a second data type.

Appellants' Contention

Appellants contend for multiple reasons that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 16-19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and claims 22-24 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

ANALYSIS

Appellants' present numerous contentions that the Hoogenboom and Ort references, relied on by the Examiner, fail to teach required claims limitations. See App. Br. 3-10. We agree with Appellants' contentions.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 16-19 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(2) Appellants have established that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 22-24 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

DECISION

The Examiner's rejections of claims 16-19 and 22-24 are reversed.

REVERSED

dw